UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,414	07/30/2001	Mitsunori Shirato	9333/278	4586

74989 7590 01/28/2008

ALPINE/BHGL
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/918,414	SHIRATO, MITSUNORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sumaiya A. Chowdhury	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/13/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 and 14-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 7, and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

   In claims 1, 7, and 15, change "genera" to –genre--.

   Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 15-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackketter (7197758) in view Legall (6005565).

As to claim 1, Blackketter teaches

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers, each program type identifier identifying at least a genre associated with a content of a program information segment (Referring to Fig. 5, the Program Segment Name and Program Type are the program type identifiers identifying a genre associated the program segment col. 5, lines 50-67, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-35);

a program type information extracting unit in communication with the receiving unit, the program type information extracting unit operable to extract a plurality of program type identifiers from an input signal (col. 7, lines 10-16, lines 27-28, lines 35-37);

A display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display a title of a program information segment, to display a plurality of program type identifiers (Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 10-15);

However, Blackketter fails to teach:

a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers invalid in response to a user input;

an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated invalid by said program type information editing unit; program type identifiers that are designated valid;

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that are designated valid;

a display unit displaying one or more program type identifiers as being invalid;

In an analogous art, Legall teaches:

a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers invalid in response to a user input (Fig. 3B; col. 3, lines 10-65);

an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated invalid by said program type information editing unit; program type identifiers that are designated valid (col. 3, lines 10-65);

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that are designated valid (col. 3, lines 10-65);

a display unit displaying one or more program type identifiers as being invalid (The invalid programs are highlighted with a color corresponding to being invalid. col. 4, lines 53-55);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Blackketter's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Legall, for the advantage of enabling a user to search an EPG with one search.

Claim 15 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 15 additionally calls for the following:

Storing results of act of associated a program type validity designation with at least one of said program type identifiers (Legall- col. 3, lines 5-8, lines 30-35, lines 50-52, lines 57-60);

As for claim 2, Blackketter teaches the receiver of claim 1 wherein said receiving unit comprises:

an antenna (col. 3, lines 30-35);

a front end unit (224) in communication with said antenna (col. 4, lines 23-26);

a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit (col. 4, lines 15-45);

a program selector (remote control device) in communication with said signal demodulator (col. 4, lines 50-55);

an audio decoder in communication with said program selector (col. 4, lines 50-55);

a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder (col. 4, lines 50-55);

an amplifier in communication with said digital to audio converter (col. 4, lines 50-55);

a speaker in communication with said amplifier (col. 4, lines 50-55).

As for claim 3, Blackketter teaches the receiver of claim 1 further comprising:

an operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit(col. 6, lines 47-64);

Legall teaches:

wherein said program type information editing unit designates the program type identifier selected by said operating unit invalid (Fig. 3B; col. 3, lines 10-65).

As for claim 4, Blackketter teaches wherein said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers (Fig. 5).

Legall teaches identifying whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is invalid (The invalid programs are highlighted with a color corresponding to being invalid. col. 4, lines 53-55).

As for claims 5 and 22, Legall teaches:

wherein the program type editing unit may designate a program type identifier to be invalid for a program even if the program type identifier was associated with the program when received by the receiving unit (During initial use, the receiver allows all programs to pass through. Thereafter, the user selectively blocks content such that the content will be filtered according to the user's criteria).

As for claim 16, Legall teaches wherein said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to a valid identification (Referring to Fig. 3B, if the user selects to show results corresponding to the data string "Jumanji", whatever is displayed after the search, corresponds to a valid identification).

As for claim 17, Legall teaches wherein said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to an invalid identification (Referring to Fig. 3b, whatever is not selected corresponds to an invalid identification).

As for claim 18, Blackketter teaches comprising the acts of: displaying information corresponding to at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers for said plurality of program information segments (Referring to Fig. 5, the Time and Content Rating are displayed corresponding to the program type identifiers); and selecting at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers (The user selects a program segment based on the identifier. Col. 6, lines 55-60).

As for claim 19, Legall teaches distinguishing program identifiers according to a program type validity designations (As discussed above, whatever the user selects to search is designated as valid.).

As for claim 20, Blackketter teaches selecting a subset of program information segments utilizing said program type identifiers as discussed above in claim 1 and

Legall teaches selecting a subset of programs using said program type validity designations as also discussed above in claim 1.

As for claim 23, Legall teaches initially setting all program type validity designations to identify all program type identifiers to be invalid (Referring to Fig. 3B, initially nothing is selected. Hence, all the program type identifiers are set to be invalid. Program type identifiers are set to be valid/invalid after the user selects what to filter out).

6. Claims 6-12, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackketter and Legall, and further in view of Goddard.

As for claims 6, 12, and 21, Blackketter teaches wherein said one or more program type identifiers comprises a first program type identifier and a second program type identifier, said first program type identifier provided by a program provider (col. 5, lines 40-55, col. 6, lines 25-30). However Blackketter and Goddard fail to teach said second program type identifier optionally added by a user.

In an analogous art, Goddard teaches the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also

be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5,

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Blackketter and Legall's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Goddard, for the advantage of allowing the user to indicated what is acceptable.

Claim 7 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 7 additionally calls for the following:

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being valid for the program information segment , even if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers was not associated with the program information segment when received by the receiving unit (As discussed above with respect to the Goddard reference in claim 6, when the content is initially received it has a predetermined rating associated with it. Goddard goes on to teach that the user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Blackketter and Legall's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Goddard, for the advantage of allowing the user to indicated what is acceptable.

As for claim 8, Blackketter teaches the receiver of claim 1 wherein said receiving unit comprises:

an antenna (col. 3, lines 30-35);

a front end unit (224) in communication with said antenna (col. 4, lines 23-26);

a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit (col. 4, lines 15-45);

a program selector (remote control device) in communication with said signal demodulator (col. 4, lines 50-55);

an audio decoder in communication with said program selector (col. 4, lines 50-55);

a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder (col. 4, lines 50-55);

an amplifier in communication with said digital to audio converter (col. 4, lines 50-55);

a speaker in communication with said amplifier (col. 4, lines 50-55).

As for claim 10, Blackketter teaches wherein said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers (Fig. 5).
Legall teaches identifying whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is invalid (The invalid programs are highlighted with a color corresponding to being invalid. col. 4, lines 53-55).

Claim 9 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 9 additionally calls for the following:
An operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit (Legall; Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 10-16).

Claim 11 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

As for claim 14, Blackketter teaches wherein said receiving unit is a digital broadcast receiving unit (col. 3, lines 30-35).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.:

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC

ANDREW Y. KOENIG
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER